

Attachment C

2007 Assessment Sample Configuration #1

Kentucky Writing Portfolio, Writing On-Demand, Core Content Test and Norm Referenced Test by Content Area and Grade

Adapted October 27, 2004

Legend: Box with an X= Indicates content assessed at grade level for school accountability
Blank box= Indicates content not assessed at grade level for school accountability
Shaded area= Indicates each type of writing assessment and grade level

Augmented NRT/Grade (NCLB)	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Reading/Language Arts	X		X	X		X				
Mathematics	X	X		X	X					

Assessment/Grade/KCCT	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Reading		X			X		X NRT	X		
Mathematics			X			X			X	
Science		X			X				X	
Social Studies			X			X			X	
Arts & Humanities			X			X			X	
Practical Living & Vocational Studies			X			X		X		

Writing Assessment	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Writing On-Demand (KCCT)			X			X			X	
Writing Collection/Portfolio	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Writing Multiple Choice-Conventions (NRT)	X			X			X			
Working Folder KRS 156.070	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→	→

- Moves on-demand writing assessment to grades 5, 8, and 11
Rationale- Assesses on-demand writing at the transition points (elementary-middle, middle-high, eleventh-senior year decisions regarding college/workplace choices)
Considerations-
 - ❑ Assesses writing for accountability twice in grades 5, 8, and 11.
 - ❑ Creates need for new standards at grades 5, 8, and 11
 - ❑ Requires professional development for teachers on the new standards
- Spreads portfolio writing across all grade levels
Rationale- Holds every grade level accountable for writing
Considerations-
 - ❑ Increases the number of pieces and time for scoring (e.g., High school with 400 students at the 12th grade level currently scores a portfolio by reviewing 5 writing entries for each student for a total of 2000 pieces of writing. If two pieces are required at each grade level [9, 10, 11, and 12]

Attachment C

2007 Assessment

Sample Configuration #1

there would be 8 pieces x 400 students for 3200 writing pieces scored annually)

- ❑ Creates need for schools that currently use entire faculty to score portfolios to develop scoring teams by grade level due to shift in benchmarks for specific grade levels and to assure scoring accuracy, or
 - ❑ Requires a school/district scoring team to internalize the standards for four different grades
 - ❑ Requires developing standards and benchmarks for every grade level
 - ❑ Creates expensive and time-consuming standards and benchmarking process
 - ❑ Gives increased emphasis to the portfolio in the assessment of writing
 - ❑ Would require a new methodology for weighting writing assessments in the accountability system
- Maintains multiple-choice items focused on assessing the conventions of writing at grades 3, 6, 9

Rationale-Continues emphasis on spelling, grammar and language mechanics

Considerations-

- ❑ Adds an assessment of writing conventions because conventions are also assessed through the portfolio and on-demand writing
- ❑ Lacks “transparency” to the public that this is an assessment of writing conventions
- ❑ Provides limited information about students’ understanding of writing conventions
- ❑ Assesses writing for accountability twice in grades 3, 6, and 9

NTAPAA Comment on this model-

John Poggio

This could be a management nightmare if portfolios are collected over several years but only scored at one time for school accountability. What about transient students? How would you track pieces from school to school or district to district? You could collect and score at the specific grade levels, but the amount of writing to track and score would be an issue. The intent is good, but would be difficult to implement. It is suggested that if the intent is to spread writing instruction and practice across more grade levels, consider having an on-demand writing assessment and portfolio assessment every other year or 2 on-demand assessments and then a portfolio assessment.